DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 265 353 CE 043 293

AUTHOR Lakes, Richard D.
TITLE Historical Inquiry in Vocational Education.
PUB DATE 8 Dec 85
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Vocational Association (Atlanta, GA, December 6-10, 1985).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Case Studies; *Educational History; *Educational Philosophy; Educational Policy; Educational Practices; *Educational Researchers; Educational Theories; Foundations of Education; *Historiography; Postsecondary Education; Research Methodology; Research Projects; Secondary Education; Social Science Research; *Vocational Education

ABSTRACT

Few dissertations on vocational educational history are being written by graduate students. Reasons for this paucity of research include: (1) few opportunities exist for employment in the foundations of education field; and (2) few mentorships are availabile for those with training in both historical methods and vocational education fields. The history of vocational education has had various trends. Early 20th-century educators propagated the myth of a universal mandate for public schools. These historians tended to ignore the social and class struggles that were a part of early public education and are essential to an understanding of it. Some early educators recognized public schooling as a ladder for social mobility. The post-World War II educational historians broadened the scope of educational history. They often fell into the class of reform liberalism. Later, revisionist historians sought a different set of motives for early school reformers. They believed that vocational education was shaped by the model of efficiency advocated by industry, and that education was made to be "efficient." Vocational education was seen as keeping the lower classes in their place. Vocational education history has been largely hortatory in approach, seeking to advance its own cause. Instead of a top-down approach, however, a bottom-up approach is needed, and is being provided today by a few scholars who are doing case studies, looking at limited areas, and trying to discover what vocational education has done for former students, rather than what educators have said vocational education should do. More of this small-scale type of research is needed to paint a clearer picture of vocational education history. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R Lakes

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED265353

HISTORICAL INQUIRY IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION[1]

Richard D. Lakes
Comprehensive Vocational Education
The Ohio State University

Doing Vocational Education History

There is a paucity of historical dissertations by vocational educators. This is understandable in that graduate students desiring to pursue historical studies often have to hurdle a variety of obstacles. Interdisciplinary studies are necessary in history and/or educational foundations departments. The course work and credit hours are often electives to established program requirements. Potential mentorships in this field are questionable. Vocational professors, often lacking the appropriate methodological skills, are usually not interested in generating historical research topics. Most vocational programs offer some history or philosophy courses. Traditional service sectors sometimes aggregate "foundations" courses into several which provide a generic overview of the field. This approach glosses over important subdisciplines that are useful for graduate students in generating research questions. Finally, the outlook for employment in vocational education with history specializations is bleak. Vocational teacher educators, curriculum development specialists and policy makers do not generally secure the consulting services of an educational historian. Federal funding for humanities-based research

---

1. Presented at an AVERA symposium on "Dissertation Research Questions: History & Philosophy, Leadership and Policy," at the annual meeting of the American Vocational Association, Atlanta, Ga. December 8, 1985.

CE043293

is at an all-time low. Tenure-track lines or endowed chairs in foundations of vocational education are virtually nonexistent.

Why would a graduate student want to specialize in the history of vocational education? I have examined some of the abstracts of the past ten years of historical vocational education dissertations. Where major advisors are listed, the dissertations seem to be clustered around scholars, for instance, like Arthur Wirth at Washington University in St. Louis, who are known for their acumen and longevity in vocational education history. Under his guidance, two important biographies of Charles Prosser and Calvin Woodward were undertaken.[1] Other dissertations indicate that strong foundations of education faculty -- hybrid historians specializing in vocational education research -- are similar bellwethers. Two University of Illinois, Champaign - Urbana graduate students produced excellent studies on progressive era ideology and practices exhibited by a variety of industrial educational reform groups.[2] A University of Minnesota dissertation added significantly to the historiography surrounding the rationale of early vocational education leaders. Several dissertations have produced needed histories of the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education.[3] I would like to offer one final observation. Historical dissertation research is often delimited by the geographic locale of archival sources. Graduate students tended to investigate topics within one days driving time of their university.[4] These sketchy examples suggest that graduate students formulating historical topics might be influenced or attracted by the notoriety of scholars in their "foundations of education" faculty. A more thorough perusal of dissertation committee

memberships would reveal those faculty who sat on committees holding appointments in "foundations" areas. Similar investigations could reveal the academic lineage of scholars with an historical interest in vocational education. In addition, graduate students seem to be influenced by the accessability to primary sources. For conclusive findings it is necessary, for comparison purposes, to geographically map the settings of historical dissertations vis a vis home universities. An investigation of agencies that fund dissertation research might reveal a pattern for awarding support to institutions specializing in educational history. Finally, an investigation of the graduate student's academic background, training, major and minor areas and career goals might suggest important proclivities for doing historical research.

Vocational Education Historiography

Henry Ford, quoted as saying "history is bunk", repudiated historical scholarship. Yet, in Greenfield Village, he captured much of his "lost" childhood. This nonsequitur provides a good example of the political uses of history. The dates, places, eras, people and events that comprise the "facts" of the historical profession are meaningless to the average American. Ford, every bit a modernist in the business sense, realized that the public would flock to his anachronistic village to vicariously live an arcadian past and the lifestyle it represented. He carefully chose to marshall evidence that would glorify a past marked by a smooth transition to factory mechanization. Fordism offered the ideology of grandeur, progress and destiny to the American public.[5]

A similar outlook prevailed in the formation of the education profession. Early twentieth century educators propagated the myth of a universal mandate for public schools. Stanford educational administrator Ellwood Cubberly portrayed schools as the great engines of democracy. His History of Education(1920), provided the teacher educator with the opportunity to instill an esprit de corps within prospective teachers.[6] This helped to legitimate a growing educational profession. A strengthened professionalism would heighten public acclaim of the difficulties of teaching as well as build morale within the ranks. Professor of Manual Arts Charles A. Bennett provided a similar booster history for the prospective industrial educator. His two volume History of Manual and Industrial Education(1926,36), a standard reference work in the field, was written as a result of the difficulties he encountered in trying to help students build an adequate historical background essential to the understanding of the present-day problems of public education.[7] Overly preoccupied with the details of formal institutions of instruction, his history ignores the political struggles --successes and defeats-- which shaped the modern curriculum. Bennett deliberately chose to emphasize the past individuals, institutions, and practices he was familiar with. This former machinist writes "No conscious effort has been made to emphasize or even, in most cases, to indicate the relationship between the past and the present."[8] Thereby, his history overlooked the essential cultural forces that shaped the present form of industrial education. He lacks what Bernard Bailyn calls "the historian's instinct", that the social forces of the historian's world were most likely nonexistent in past life.[9] Dismissing these types of histories

as overly parochial, a new crop of post-world war II educational historians would broaden the scope of institutional history.

Lawrence Cremin's The Transformation Of The School(1961) signaled the beginning of a new historiography.[10] Following the Bailyn dictum, Cremin would investigate those previously neglected informal cultural aspects of education, i.e., family, church and community. True, Cremin was interested in a vast and abundant variety of cultural life. But his desire to seek consensus/continuity fell short of accounting for conflict and struggle. Little sympathy was accorded those elements of spontaneity, effervescence and violence, charges historian John Higham, as conflict becomes muted and consensus gives us bland history.[11] Throughout his histories, public schooling is recognized as a ladder for social mobility and equal opportunity. It is a benevolent and benign institution with well-meaning actors. Progress, ie., reform, is defined as a common vision shared in the fundamental soundness of educational institutions. Conflict is mitigated by willing acquiescence or propitiation to social structures. Vocational education histories written during this period have also exhibited a similar reform liberalism. Often, both labor and business interests are represented as undeniably faithful to public education. "The attitude of labor has always been an important factor in the progress of industrial education", writes Melvin Barlow (former American Vocational Association Historian and Professor Emeritus of Vocational Education at University of California, Los Angeles) in his History of Industrial Education In The United States(1967).[12] Barlow proceeds to explain the American Federation of Labor's support for industrial education. However, throughout his

work American labor is portrayed both monolithically (the voice of Samuel Gompers) and monomaniacally ("that labor supported public education there can be no doubt").[13] Business support for industrial education is similarly characterized via the National Association of Manufacturers.[14] Institutional history, in this sense, is merely a chronicling of voluntary interest group demands. Similar hegemonic values favor rhetorical goals while confirming shared assumptions about reform. Industrial education is chosen because of its beneficent outcomes. Vocational education serves more students of diverse socio-economic backgrounds and increases career choice, economic standing and educational level. Future institutional histories will have to do better than assume elite domination. They must look at the processes of decision making and the perspectives these institutions held for social classes and individuals.[15]

A rival group of educational historians, called revisionists, sought a different set of motives for early school reformers. The questions they asked attempted to test out social theory.[16] Do public institutions create class divisions which ensure elite power and control? Does school bureaucracy provide a mechanism for shoring up the middle class? Do working classes oppose school expansion and reform? Their leading spokesman, Michael B. Katz, revealed the revisionist perspective when applied to public schooling.

> "The development of public education cannot be understood apart from the social relations between classes, anxieties about disorder, attempts to shore up a social structure under stress, and the invention of modern forms of bureaucracy."[17]

Joel Spring, Paul Violas and others argued that the adoption of

business values by school administrators were used to militate against the lower classes.[18] Industrially derived segmentation and regimentation were similarly exhibited in scientifically managed public institutions. Raymond Callahan's pioneer work Education and The Cult of Efficiency(1962), drew upon the numerous examples of business adoption of scientific management techniques in schools.[19] He determined that school superintendents readily adopted business practices. In addition, school boards were composed of business types who espoused the "efficiency" rhetoric of the era. Autonomous school administrators were finding their domain was becoming increasingly centralized due to the prescence of school board rule. Callahan stressed that the twentieth century school administrator was extremely vulnerable to the whims of the school board. He argued that educational leaders capitulated "to whatever demands were made upon them."[20] Callahan concluded that the total effect of a rudderless leadership was,

> "adopting values and practices indiscriminately and applying them with little or no consideration of educational values or purposes. It was not that some of the ideas from the business world might not have been used to advantage in educational administration, but that the wholesale adoption of the basic values, as well as the techniques of the business-industrial world, was a serious mistake in an institution whose primary purpose was the education of children."[21]

Scientific management in the schools, revisionists claimed, was a vehicle for social control. Schools tracked students into class-related levels in order to prepare them for their eventual social dispositions. Children of the working classes would receive an education that "fit" them for industrial life. Values such as docility, discipline and cooperation were inculcated through

vocational training. Paul Violas in The Training of The Urban Working Class(1978) provides a convincing argument for the social control thesis.[22] Evaluating the rhetoric of early proponents of industrial education, Violas suggests that vocational training would accommodate a "new" student who could adjust to the modern demands of industry.

> "The labor force now required workers with habits, values, and personality patterns conducive to assembly line techniques. . . The rationale for industrial education maintained that such learning would develop in the future industrial worker psychic structures that would increase his productivity and diminish his alienation."[23]

Violas' portrait of the various curricular support services, i.e., career guidance and intelligence testing, fueled his thesis that schools were the mechanism for sorting students into the industrial laboring class. Each child has a distinct occupational future that was limited by class backgrounds.

> "The reality depicted by the public schools, and especially the vocational guidance movement, portrayed industrial vocations as normal expectations for working-class children. Within the prescribed boundaries of this reality, students could choose their future vocations."[24]

Historians, scrutinizing the importance of social efficiency doctrine, suggest that a belief in social predestination would maintain the status quo. Arthur Wirth claims that vocationalists were strongly aligned with social efficiency forces. Other educational leaders, he says, adopted a more humanistic outlook for schoolings role in society. In Education in the Technological Society: The Vocational-Liberal Studies Controversy in the Early Twentieth Century(1980), Wirth explicates these two themes through the counterpoising of John Dewey and David Snedden. By examining the

Snedden-Dewey debates over dual control of the Illinois educational system, Wirth claims "Sneddenism" is the source of a conservative philosophy that buttressed an educational social sorting function. Some critics might argue that Wirth is drawing a false dichotomy specifically intended to destroy the credibility of vocational educations principles and practices. On the contrary, he has attempted to distinguish the degrees of progressive reform. Wirth separates a fanciful liberal progressivism from the more prosaic conservative variety. Liberal reformism is equated with democracy and social service. Conservative progressivism represents efficiency and social control.[25] Continued historical inquiry will help to explain the legacy of progressivism for industrial education.

Revisionist educational historians such as W. Norton Grubb and Marvin Lazerson, offered a coup de grace to prior vocational apologists by suggesting that "the writing of the history of vocational education has been largely hortatory, designed to elicit support for vocationalism."[26] This statement has characterized the immense imbroglio that occured between the revisionists and the liberal interpreters in the past decades. Cool dispassionate scholarship was reduced to name-calling and mudslinging. Fueled by Diane Ravitch's book The Revisionists Revised(1977), rejoinders escalated to absurd charges that some university's cabalistically supported radical scholarship; thereby, promoting political revolution. Countercharges attacked the political motivation of funding sources supporting liberal history monographs.[27] Historian James Sanders suggests that the ideological orientations in the revisionist controvery stemmed from the question of equal opportunity

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

in America. Although still relevant in the 1980's, he claims that the prior contentiousness of the debate has dwindled into a "stalemate for the protagonists and boredom for the less ideological bystanders."[28]

Vocational Education History and Revisionism

Vocational education historical works written during the 1970's reflected an overwhelming intent to disprove the revisionist thesis. Turn-of-the-century school reformers were characterized as exhibiting various political positions. Since any one reformist vision was subscribed to by a limited number of people, progressive educators exhibited a panoply of diverse motives. Curriculum reforms mirrored this variegated pattern of special interest groups.[29] Dennis Hershbach's dissertation Industrial Education Ideology, 1876-1917(1973) was an early study of the complex ideological frameworks that drove industrial education policy. Coalitions formed, dissolved and re-aligned in a mutable interlocking directorate. The early twentieth century marked a watershed in changing views of educational reform but the social reform drive initiated by Horace Mann was still there. Secular piety, millenialism, scientism, efficiency or radical meliorism, it didn't matter what you called it, progressivism represented a transition toward increased confidence in public schooling. Reforms often resulted in an attempt to resolve inherent complications of industrial life. For instance, Hershbach describes the elements of conflict regarding the proper education of the immigrant child.

> "On the one hand, the proponents of industrial education pointed to the fact that the subject could contribute to the upward mobility of the aliens; industrial education could provide the necessary skills, attitudes and

habits essential to success in an industrial environment. It could help Americanize the immigrant. On the other hand, industrial educators reflected the existing social anatagonism towards immigrants, and the subject field was seen as a means of controlling the social and economic success of the immigrant, to the extent that native children could be provided with a marked advantage in the industrial enterprise."[30]

Currently, similar historical inquiry has been directed to other target groups (e.g, blacks, women, working classes) in an on-going analysis of the consequences of industrial education.[31]

Vocational educators, rarely questioning the assumptions of their discipline, have been criticized for an excessive filiopiety. Hershbach's examination of past developments in vocational-industrial education recognized the importance of re-evaluating the historic foundations of the field. Soon other vocational educators would fall under Clio's spell. Charles J. Law's plea for a usable vocational history -- one that would help reconstruct a philosophical basis for the discipline -- required a re-assessment of the foundations. Law realized that the philosophic base is, in reality, still evolving and currently ill-defined. He writes:

"We retreat to the original tenets of our founding fathers for support and, thus are schizophrenic. Is it any wonder we appear to friend and foe alike to be inexplicable even to ourselves?"[32]

Katy Greenwood demonstrated that it was acceptable for vocational educators to reassess the historical intentions of the early leaders without committing apostasy. Her scholarship calls for, in part, an examination of the professions philosophical premises. Greenwood writes:

"Re-examination and re-development of a philosophic rationale as an integral part of the perpetuation and

development of the field is a necessary and desirable activity; it represents the core endeavor of establishing a body of knowledge."[33]

Her dissertation on Prosser's and Snedden's early motives entailed the construction of a model classifying several important pre-world war I educational philosophies. This was an analytical device used to bring clarity to reformers underlying intentions. These vocational leaders had a distinct utilitarian philosophy, she argues, based upon the Prosser-inspired notion of mobility, i.e., the acquisition of job preparation skills. Her conclusions represent a conscious effort to rescue Prosser from the legacy of social efficiency. Vocational educators could, as she claims, recognize utilitarianism as the guiding philosophical foundation for the field. Her work provides important directives for vocational educators intending to research the foundations areas. At a 1979 AVA symposium on vocational historiography, Greenwood charges that vocational educators must begin to assume responsibility for interpreting their own history and philosophy. They should enter the revisionist debate armed with a knowledge of historical methods. They should be aware of the bias in so-called "presentist" history. Most importantly, historical inquiry provides an opportunity for clarifying current policy and leadership in the field. Historical introspection is necessary in order to illuminate the assumptions of the field.[34]

Vocational researchers are beginning to recognize some of the neglected foundations areas. At a recent colloquium sponsored by the American Vocational Education Research Association, Merle Strong emphasized that historical research should become a recognized and respected activity in the research community. He writes:

> "Few become excited about historical research in vocational and technical education. However, we seem to be reaching a point in our development in which many newcomers are discovering, sometimes by accident, what has been known for years. This is not to say that we should do historical research in order to repeat history but, rather, so that we may learn from it."[35]

Vocational historians, less hesitant than before, are beginning to chip away at clay feet. Since 1925, vocational practices have been guided by Prosser's sixteen theorems. Melvin Miller argues that the field of vocational education has been guided by principles instead of a philosophy. He suggests that the continual adherence to Prosser's theorems is indicative of the substitution of principles for philosophy.

> "The principles of vocational education <u>have been</u> substituted for a philosophy for vocational education. However, principles of vocational education do not equate a philosophy for vocational education, and the contemporary principles of vocational education should not be substituted for a philosophy."[36]

Recently, William Camp and John Hillison have reassessed Prosser's theorems in light of the changing societal notions of work. They suggest that the shift from a smokestack to a service-sector economy, with a subsequent de-skilling of industrial jobs, has important consequences for a reformulation of vocational philosophy. They recommend that those theorems that are no longer applicable must be discarded.[37] Historical scholarship, within the field, reflects the quandry over the founders egalitarian claims. Part of the difficulty is the problem with terminology. Industrial eduction is a tautology confusing the meaning of trade-specific training. In his history of the National Association of Manufacturers, Kenneth C. Gray argues that broad interpretations over terminology created problems for continued

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

business and labor support for industrial education. Differing agreement over the outcomes of trade schooling proved detrimental to the movement. Declining membership in the National Society for The Promotion of Industrial Education and a move toward in-house training were manifestations of manufacturers less than enthusiastic endorsement of public vocational education.[38]

Post-Revisionist Inquiry

Part of the difficulty in researching the history of vocational education is determining the motives and intents of the early reform leaders. A kind of medieval scholasticism surrounds the ongoing debate. Combative scholarship, limited to disputations over authoritative claims, restricts the boundaries of original research. This "top-down" history is clearly unable to examine the general publics response to vocationalism. Historian Julia Wrigley astutely charges,

> "Reforms and social changes, according to both the revisionist educational historians and the corporate liberal theorists, are primarily generated by an elite to maintain their own position and are seldom a response to effective pressure from below. Neither set of historians readily admits the existence of potentially destabilizing elements in the society."[39]

The educational historians task is changing as post-revisionist inquiry overtakes the field. What are the family decisions that impact school going? How have workers responded to their changing faith in education? What were the patterns of school attendance according to socio-economic class, racial background and gender differences?[40] Educational historian David Angus articulates the post-revisionist perspective when he writes:

> "One feature shared by virtually all interpretations of the rise of mass high schooling, whether liberal or revisionist, is a heavy reliance on analyzing the words of educators rather than their deeds. Books and journal articles, the proceedings of professional associations, the reports of commissions, etc., form the raw materials from which the debate is forged. Little attention has been devoted to what actually went on in high schools in this period, who attended, for how long, what students studied and how they fared. Beyond the analysis of educational rhetoric, no good case has been made for or against the notion that high schools in the early twentieth century were sharply class biased."[41]

"Bottom-up" analysis of students and schools, often using the methods of quantitative social science research, is characteristic of the latest trend in vocational education history. Curriculum histories predominate the field. Paul Ringle's excellent historical study of Fitchburg High School provides one example of the trend towards isolated case studies. Ringle suggests that vocational schooling provided greater mobility for its graduates. His analysis of inter-generational occupational patterns showed that Fitchburg graduates had higher status "white-collar" jobs than their parents. Ringle's study becomes an important source for an analysis of vocational education outcomes.[42] Two recent dissertations have examined vocational curriculum reforms in local settings. Leigh Altadoona's study of the Philadelphia public schools and Richard Caster's research on the Canton City Schools reveal the influence of progressivism in municipal government. Industrial education was significantly impacted by active community reformers.[43] Further urban histories are needed that will reveal the extent to which local and state progressive reforms mirrored the national movement. Daniel Rodgers and David Tyack suggest that "much of the early political history of vocationalism remains obscure." They state:

> "Support came from virtually everywhere, or so the vote on the Smith-Hughes Act would lead us to believe. But the Smith-Hughes coalition was potentially a fragile one, shot through as it was with tension between labor's dream of prying open the doors to advancement and management's vision of the schools as an efficient training and sorting mechanism. How long did that alliance hold together? To what extent was it duplicated at the state and local levels? Who pushed first and hardest within local school districts for vocational education courses: employers, labor spokesmen, state education officials, local school personnel, or parents?"[44]

Future historical research should shed light on the reform struggles played out in America's backwater cities and towns. Small-scale research can offer a comparison of urban and/or rural support for educational reforms. Local and regional analysis could facilitate an understanding of patterns of school attendance. Case studies can identify the elements of the school curriculum. Post-revisionism illuminates the close local study of school participants, administrators, parents and supporters. Only community studies can offer this analysis of the impact of schooling on the individual. Newer methodologies, characterized by their lack of a national focus, avoid "sweeping" synthesis due to the vernacular differences of each study. This is indicative of the social history trend in educational history. Micro-level analysis illuminates a variety of interpretations about support for public schools. Post-revisionism represents the study of the social aspects such as class, ethnicity, gender and race which are unique to the development of schools in this country. Some historians, lamenting the lack of synthesis in their respective fields, feel that post-revisionism creates even more diffuse and fragmented research. Yet, new lines of inquiry in social history divulge the uniqueness of the American

45

experience.

Footnotes

1. Charles M. Dye, "Calvin Milton Woodward, A Leader Of The Manual Training Movement In American Education" (Ph.D. dissertation, Washington University, 1971). John Gadell, "Charles Allen Prosser: His Work In Vocational And General Education" (Ph.D. dissertation, Washington University, 1972).

2. Dennis R. Herschbach, "Industrial Education Ideology, 1876-1917: A Social And Historical Analysis" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana - Champaign, 1973). Peter A Sola, "Plutocrats, Pedagogues and Plebes: Business Influences On Voocational Education And Extracurricular Activities In The Chicago High Schools 1899-1925" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana - Champaign, 1972).

3. Katy L.B. Greenwood, "A Philosophic Rationale For Vocational Education: Contributions Of Charles A. Prosser and His Contemporaries From 1900 to 1917" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1978). Robert Ripley Clough, "The National Society For The Promotion Of Industrial Education," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wisconsin, 1957). Sheldon Joseph LLoyd "An Investigation into the Development of the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education and its Role in Promoting Federal Aid for Vocational Education 1906-1917," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Maryland, 1979).

4. see, for example, Richard J. Caster, "Curricular Change In The Canton City Schools, 1895-1939: From Manual Training To Vocational Education" (Ed.D. dissertation, University of Akron, 1980). Innocenzio A. Grignano, "The Industrial And Training School Concept In Allegheny County: An Historical Analysis" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Pittsburgh, 1975). Norman W. Richards, "Who's In Control? Industrial Education In The Boston Public Schools, 1870-1920" (Ph.D. dissertation, Boston College, 1976). Samuel H. Shannon, "Agricultural And Industrial Education At Tennessee State University During The Normal School Phase 1912-1922: A Case Study" (Ph.D. dissertation, George Peabody College For Teachers, 1974).

5. see chapter 5 "Henry Ford: Symbol Of An Age" in Roderick Nash, The Nervous Generation: American Thought, 1917-1930, Chicago, Ill.: Rand McNally, 1970.

6. Educational administrator Ellwood Cubberley is the most important as an early writer of history of education. Ellwood P. Cubberley, The History of Education, Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin, 1920.

7. Charles A. Bennett, Professor of Manual Arts, was Cubberlley's contemporary in a similar ideological vein. He wrote a two volume History of Manual and Industrial Education

1870-1917, Peoria, Ill: Chas. A. Bennett Co., 1926,1936. His rationale is briefly revealed in the preface to volume 1, page 3. For a brief biographical sketch see John P. Schenck "Charles A. Bennett Remembered", The Technology Teacher (November 1983), pp 8-10.

8. Ibid., p.3.

9. Bernard Bailyn, Education In The Forming Of American Society, Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 1960, p.10.

10. Lawrence A. Cremin The Transformation Of The School, New York: Vintage Books, 1961.

11. John Higham Writing American History, Bloomington,Ind.: Indiana University Press, 1970, p. 146.

12. Melvin L. Barlow History of Industrial Education In The United States, Peoria,Ill.: Chas. A. Bennett Co., 1967. See especially chapter 13 "Organized Labor and Industrial Education", p. 375.

13. Ibid., p. 380.

14. Ibid., p. 379, 383.

15. for an historiographic discussion of institutional history see Paul H. Mattingly "Structures Over Time: Institutional History", in John H. Best (ed.) Historical Inquiry in Education, Washington DC: American Educational Research Association, 1983, pp. 34-55.

16. Revisionist sociologists like Melvin Tumin have challenged the 1950's functionalist theory. Functionalists believe that society works harmoniously to achieve mutually beneficial results, i.e., stratification is a system for motivating individuals to seek socially important positions and to fill these positions conscientiously by rewarding those who do so with special incentives. Tumin states that due to restricted upward mobility, functionalism encourages hostility and suspicion among those denied access to prestigious positions. It breeds an alienation of individuals and an iconoclasm of institutions. See Melvin M. Tumin Readings on Social Stratification, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1970.

17. Michael B. Katz "An Apology For American Educational History", Harvard Educational Review 49:2 (May 1979), p. 256.

18. for an excellent summarization of the revisionist orientation see chapter 8 "Urban Schooling And the Revisionist Perspective" in Ronald D. Cohen & Raymond A. Mohl The Paradox of Progressive Education, Port Washington, NY: Kennikat Press, 1979, pp. 160-175. See also Joel Spring "Education and Progressivism", History of Education Quarterly, (Spring 1970), pp. 53-68.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Clarence Karrier, Paul Violas, and Joel Spring Roots of Crisis: American Education in the Twentieth Century, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973.

19. Raymond Callahan Education and The Cult of Efficiency, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

20. Ibid., p. ii.

21. Ibid., p. 244.

22. Paul C. Violas The Training of the Urban Working Class, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1978.

23. Ibid., p. 125.

24. Ibid., p.217.

25. Arthur G. Wirth Education in the Technological Society, Lanham,MD: University Press of America, 1980, pp. 67-68. For a thorough explanation of conservative and reform progressives in society, see Robert Church Education in the United States, NY: The Free Press, 1976, pp. 255-260.

26. Marvin Lazerson and W. Norton Grubb American Education and Vocationalism, NY: Teachers College Press, 1974.

27. Diane Ravitch The Revisionists Revised: A Critique of the Radical Attack on the Schools, NY: Basic Books, 1977. See also Katy Lee Brown Greenwood "A Rational Approach to Historiography: Misuses and Abuses of History." Symposium on Historiography: The Revisionist and the Progressive Historical Interpretation of Vocational Education and Current Implications. Presented at the annual meeting of the American Vocational Association, Anaheim, CA, December 4, 1979. (ERIC Document, ED 182 478). For revisionist counterarguments, see Michael Katz "An Apology for American Educational History", Harvard Educational Review 49:2 (May 1979) pp. 256-266.

28. James Sanders "Education And The City: Urban Community Study" in John H. Best (ed.), Historical Inquiry in Education, p. 217.

29. for examples of the variety of curricular reforms in the progressive era see, Herbert M. Kliebart "Education at the Turn of the Century: A Crucible for Curriculum Change", Educational Researcher, vol. II (January 1982), pp. 16-24.] For an example of the variety of reform motives linked to vocational education, see Sol Cohen "The Industrial Education Movement, 1906-1917," American Quarterly, 20:1 (Spring 1968), pp.95-110.

30. Dennis R. Herschbach, "Industrial Education Ideology," pp. 340-41.

31. Historical inquiry of black schooling has primarily focussed

upon the reconstruction era experiences of newly freed slaves. Practical solutions to the "Negro Problem" were touted, such as General Samuel Chapman Armstrong's highly successful Hampton Institute or Booker T. Washington's Tuskegee Institute. These schools became the models for black industrial education. The widespread activities of Chapman's most famous student Booker T. Washington are the primary focus for revisionist historians. Washington has been portrayed as an accommodationist serving up an education that accepted black social and political inequality, see Donald Spivey Schooling for the New Slavery: Black Industrial Education, 1868-1915, Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1978. See also Samuel Henry Shannon "Agricultural and Industrial Education at Tennessee State University during the Normal School Phase 1912-1922: A Case Study," (Ph.D. dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1974). Shannon charges that the focus of industrial education was to produce teachers (provided with manual training) who could reproduce proper work discipline throughout the population of Southern blacks. Instead of mirroring the white land grant emphasis on scientific agriculture or trade training, Tennessee State functioned primarily as a Normal School. Students at Tennessee State, Shannon claims, were never seriously considered for trade or apprenticeship training. For an excellent overview of black industrial education, see James D. Anderson "The Historical Development of Black Vocational Education," in Kantor and Tyack Work, Youth and Schooling, pp. 180-222. Also, Willena Wilkinson Stanford "Black Americans and Vocational and Practical Arts Education --An Historical Development: 1750-1954," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Wyoming, 1984). Gender analysis in vocational education history has been informed by the feminist perspective. Female-only work or school experiences provided an environment for feminist consciousness raising and the creation of an autonomous homosocial community. For an example of this thesis in a study of department store sales women, see Susan Porter Benson "'The Customers Ain't God': The Work Culture of Department Store Saleswomen, 1890-1949," in Michael H. Frisch and Daniel J. Walkowitz (eds.) Working-Class America: Essays on Labor, Community, and American Society, Urbana,Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1983, pp. 185-211. Homosocial bonding was manifest in early twentieth century political action such as consumer protection, suffrage, tenement reform and child labor. The potential impact of home economists on legislative activity is suggested in Edna K. B. McBreen "The Interface Between Family Law and the Family Relationship Concerns of Home Economics: A Historical Analysis," (Ph.D. dissertation, Cornell University, 1982). Two recent studies of the founding philosophy and history of home economics offer convincing evidence of the broadening professional sphere of women outside the family and home. See Virginia Bramble Vicenti "A History of the Philosophy of Home Economics," (Ph.D. dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1981) and Judy Annette Jax "A Comparative Analysis of the Meaning of Home Economics: The 1899-1908 Lake Placid Conferences and Home Economics: A Definition," (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1981).

32. The seminal work on re-evaluating vocational philosophy is Charles J. Law "A Search For A Philosophy Of Vocational Education", Presented at the Annual Meeting of State Directors of Vocational Education, Washington D.C., May 12-16, 1975. (ERIC Document, Ed 126 368), p. 34.

33. Katy Lee Brown Greenwood "A Philosophic Rationale For Vocational Education: Contributions of Charles A. Prosser and His Contemporaries From 1900 to 1917" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Minnesota, 1978), p. 25.

34. Katy Lee Brown Greenwood "A Rational Approach to Historiography: Misues and Abuses of History," Annual meeting of the American Vocational Association, Anaheim,CA , December 1979, (ERIC document 182 478). See also, Hallie Preskill "Why We Must Study History and Philosophy," VocEd 59:2 (March 1984), p. 16. The problems with "presentist" history are explained in David Hackett Fischer Historians' Fallacies, NY: Harper & Row, 1970, pp. 135-40.

35. Merle E. Strong "Vocational Education Research for the 1980's," Henry David, et.al. (eds.)Vocational Education Research in the 1980's, Washington, DC: American Vocational Education Research Association, 1983, p. 105.

36. Melvin D. Miller Principles and a Philosophy for Vocational Education, Columbus,OH: The National Center for Research in Vocational Education, 1985, pp. 4-5. See also, Melvin D. Miller "Early Values Underlying Vocational Education," in Katy Greenwood (ed.) Contemporary Challenges for Vocational Education(1982 AVA Yearbook), Arlington,Va: American Vocational Association, 1981, pp. 63-69.

37. William G. Camp and John H. Hillison "Prosser's Sixteen Theorems: Time for Reconsideration," Journal of Vocational and Technical Education 1:1 (Fall 1984), pp. 13-21. See also, William G. Camp "Social Efficiency and Vocational Education: An Examination of Our Changing Philosophies" Journal of Vocational Education Research 8:3 (Summer 1983), pp. 10-19. William G. Camp "Social Efficiency Revisited: A Cornerstone of the Foundation," Journal of the American Association of Teacher Educators in Agriculture, 23:2 (July 1982), pp. 35-40, 60.

38. Kenneth C. Gray "Historic and Continuting Debates Over Terminology," in Katy Greenwood (ed.) Contemporary Challenges for Vocational Education, pp. 37-47. For a history of one business groups support for vocational education, see Kenneth Carter Gray "Support for Industrial Education by the National Association of Manufacturers: 1895-1917," (Ph.D. dissertation, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, 1980).

39. Julia Wrigley Class Politics and Public Schools, New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1982, p.11.

40. For an elaboration of post-revisionist inquiry in vocational education history see Daniel T. Rodgers and David B. Tyack "Work, Youth and Schooling: Mapping Critical Research Areas" in Kantor & Tyack (eds.) Work, Youth, And Schooling, Stanford,Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1982, pp. 269-294.

41. David Angus "Vocationalism and the Blueing of the High School: Grand Rapids, Michigan, 1900-1920," Unpublished Manuscript, p. 3. See also, Joel Perlmann "Curriculum and Tracking in the Transformation of the American High School: Providence, R.I. 1880-1939," Journal of Social History 19:1 (Fall 1985), pp. 29-56.

42. Paul J. Ringle "The Introduction and Development of Manual Training and Industrial Education in the Public Schools of Fitchburg, Massachusetts, 1893-1929," (Ph.D. dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1980). See also, Paul J. Ringle "A Response to the Criticisms of Job Training," in Katy Greenwood (ed.) Contemporary Challenges for Vocational Education, pp. 129-141.

43. Richard J. Caster "Curricular Change in the Canton City Schools, 1895-1939: From Manual Training to Vocational Education," (Ed.D. dissertation, University of Akron, 1980). Leigh Joseph Altadonna "The School, Curriculum, and Community: A Case Study of the Institutionalizing of Industrial Education in the Public Schools of Philadelphia, 1876-1918," (Ed.D. dissertation, Columbia University Teachers College, 1983).

44. Daniel T. Rodgers and David B. Tyack "Work, Youth and Schooling: Mapping Critical Research Areas," in Kantor and Tyack (eds.) Work, Youth and Schooling, p. 284.

45. For an example of the search for synthesis in the "new" labor history, see David Brody "The Old Labor History and The New: In Search of An American Working Class," Labor History XX (Winter 1979), pp. 111-126.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE